



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/531,340

04/14/2005

Laurent Regnier

S1022.81221US00

5057

46329

7590

06/06/2008

STMicroelectronics Inc.

c/o WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 Atlantic Avenue

BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER

MASKULINSKI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2113

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,340

Applicant(s)

REGNIER, LAURENT

Examiner

Michael C. Maskulinski

Art Unit

2113

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 6, 10, 13 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Final Office Action

Claim Objections

1. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, "the same identifier in a last detected jump" should be "the same identifier *is* a last detected jump". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shah et al., U.S. Patent 6,148,437.

Referring to claim 1:

- a. In column 2, lines 55-57, Shah et al. disclose that the present invention is a jump-evaluating trace designator that includes an original instruction processor (A method for transmitting digital messages through output terminals of a monitoring circuit integrated to a microprocessor on execution of an instruction sequence by the microprocessor, each digital message being representative of characteristic data stored by the monitoring circuit on detection of a specific event from among several specific events in the execution of the instruction sequence, one of said characteristic data corresponding to an identifier of said specific event).

- b. In column 6, lines 62-65, Shah et al, disclose that the backpatch manager examines a trace after it has been translated to determine if any other previously translated trace has a jump instruction that jumps to the newly translated trace (comparing characteristic stored data of a specific event with characteristic stored data of a last previously detected specific event corresponding to a same identifier).
- c. In column 4, line 67 continued in column 5, lines 1-3, Shah et al. disclose that the start-end designator designates a jump instruction to be the end of the trace if the number of times that control has passed through it reaches a predetermined end-trace threshold (if the compared characteristic data are identical, incrementing a repetition counter associated with said specific event).
- d. In column 12, lines 43-48, Shah et al. disclose that if there is no match between the unique identifier of the current original instruction and any entry in a column, driver in a known manner creates a new original instruction record by creating a new row of entries in instruction data structure (and if the compared data are different, transmitting a digital message representative of the data characteristic of the specific event). In column 12, lines 57-62, Shah et al. disclose after assigning a unique identifier it determines whether the instruction is a target instruction of a start-trace eligible jump instruction so that a trace is started if such target instruction's start-trace counter is greater than the start-trace threshold of the start-trace eligible jump instruction (and, further, if content

of the repetition counter associated with said specific event is different from zero, transmitting a digital message indicating a repetition of the specific event).

Referring to claims 2 and 11, in column 4, line 67 continued in column 5, lines 1-3, Shah et al. disclose that the start-end designator designates a jump instruction to be the end of the trace if the number of times that control has passed through it reaches a predetermined end-trace threshold (the digital message indicating a repetition of the specific event comprises the content of the repetition counter associated with said specific event).

Referring to claims 3 and 12, in column 5, lines 49-51, Shah et al. discloses that if such a counter reaches the end-trace threshold for the associated type of jump instruction, the trace is ended (comprising resetting the repetition counter associated with said specific event after transmission of a digital message indicating a repetition of the specific event).

Referring to claims 5 and 14, in column 2, lines 55-57, Shah et al. disclose a. jump-evaluating trace (the specific event is a jump in the instruction sequence executed by the microprocessor and the last previously detected specific event corresponding to the same identifier in a last detected jump).

Referring to claims 7 and 16, in column 2, lines 55-57, Shah et al. disclose a jump-evaluating trace. A jump instruction is inherently a read or write operation in a computer system.

Referring to claim 8, in column 5, lines 49-51, Shah et al. discloses that if such a counter reaches the end-trace threshold for the associated type of jump instruction, the

trace is ended (transmitting a digital message indicating a repetition of the specific event if the content of the repetition counter associated with said specific event is greater than a determined threshold; and setting the repetition counter associated with said specific event to zero).

Referring to claim 9:

- a. In column 2, lines 55-57, Shah et al. disclose that the present invention is a jump-evaluating trace designator that includes an original instruction processor (A device for transmitting digital messages between a monitoring circuit (1-g) integrated to with a microprocessor (1-2) and an analysis tool (2-4), on execution of an instruction sequence by the microprocessor, comprising: a-- means for detecting a specific event from among several specific events in the execution of the instruction sequence; a--means for storing data characteristic of the detected specific event, one of said characteristic data corresponding to an identifier of the specific event; and a--means for transmitting a digital message representative of the memorized stored characteristic data).
- b. In column 6, lines 62-65, Shah et al, disclose that the backpatch manager examines a trace after it has been translated to determine if any other previously translated trace has a jump instruction that jumps to the newly translated trace (means for comparing the characteristic data of the detected specific event with characteristic data of a previously detected specific event corresponding to the same identifier).

- c. In column 4, line 67 continued in column 5, lines 1-3, Shah et al. disclose that the start-end designator designates a jump instruction to be the end of the trace if the number of times that control has passed through it reaches a predetermined end-trace threshold (means for incrementing a repetition counter associated with said detected specific event and indicating a number of repetitions of the detected specific event when the comparison means provides a signal indicating that the compared characteristic data are identical).
- d. In column 12, lines 43-48, Shah et al. disclose that if there is no match between the unique identifier of the current original instruction and any entry in a column, driver in a known manner creates a new original instruction record by creating a new row of entries in instruction data structure (wherein the transmission means is capable of transmitting a message representative of the data characteristic of the detected specific event when the comparison means provides a signal indicating that the compared characteristic data are different and, transmitting a digital message indicating a repetition of the detected specific event when the incrementation means provides a signal indicating that content of the repetition counter associated with said detected specific event is different from zero).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4, 6, 10, 13, and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed February 29, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
6. On page 7, under REMARKS, the Applicant argues, "Therefore, the start-trace counter for the current target instruction is incremented upon each occurrence of the current target instruction. In contrast, claim 1 recites 'if the compared characteristic data are identical, incrementing a repetition counter associated with said specific event.'" The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant attempts to contrast the claim language with the prior art, however, given the broadest reasonable interpretation, "characteristic data" is nothing more than an "identifier" as defined by the language of claim 1. In order for the counter of Shah et al. to be incremented the when a jump instruction is identified (see column 16, lines 28-36 and Figure 8A).
7. On pages 8-9, under REMARKS, the Applicant argues, "Therefore, Shah does not teach or suggest 'comparing characteristic stored data of a specific event with characteristic stored data of a last previously detected specific event corresponding to a same identifier; if the compared characteristic data are identical, incrementing a repetition counter associated with said specific even,' as recited in claim 1." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated above characteristic data is the same as an identifier. Once an instruction has been identified, the counter is incremented (see Shah et al., column 18, lines 37-42). Further, in column 18, lines 62-67, Shah et al. disclose that the value of current start-trace counter 906C may be greater than the value of the current start threshold because a previous incrementation may have been

made with respect to a type of jump instruction having a start threshold greater than the start threshold of the current jump instruction.

8. On pages 8-9, under REMARKS, the Applicant argues, "In contrast, claim 1 recites 'if the compared data are different, transmitting a digital message representative of the data characteristic of the specific event and, further, if content of the repetition counter associated with said specific event is different from zero, transmitting a digital message indicating a number of repetitions of the specific event determined by a value of the repetition counter.'" The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 12, lines 43-48, Shah et al. disclose that if there is no match between the unique identifier of the current original instruction and any entry in a column, driver in a known manner creates a new original instruction record by creating a new row of entries in instruction data structure. Further, in column 12, lines 57-62, Shah et al. disclose after assigning a unique identifier it determines whether the instruction is a target instruction of a start-trace eligible jump instruction so that a trace is started if such target instruction's start-trace counter is greater than the start-trace threshold of the start-trace eligible jump instruction.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Maskulinski whose telephone number is (571)272-3649. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on 571-272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael C Maskulinski/

Art Unit: 2113

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2113